

Appl. No. : **09/933,277**
Filed : **August 20, 2001**

REMARKS

This communication is responsive to the Office Action dated March 23, 2007, which was issued in response to Applicants' Third Appeal Brief. Applicants' representative would like to thank Mr. Pezzuto for the courtesy he extended during the interview conducted on May 3, 2007.

All of the pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Knorr (U.S. Pub. 2002/0077929) in view of Robertson (U.S. Pat. 6,609,106), with the exception that dependent Claims 2 and 13 have been found allowable. Applicants respectfully submit the rejection is improper because, among other reasons, Knorr and Robertson do not collectively teach or suggest the notification-related features of the independent claims.

For example, with respect to independent Claim 1, Knorr and Robertson do not collectively teach or suggest "a notification component which is responsive, to an online request from a first user for a catalog page which includes a description of a first item, by at least (a) determining whether the first item is on an electronic wish list of a user who is affiliated with the first user, and (b) when the first item is determined to be on an electronic wish list of a second user who is affiliated with the first user, supplementing the page with a notification that the first item is on the wish list of the second user," in the context of the other limitations of the claim.

With respect to independent Claim 12, Knorr and Robertson do not collectively teach or suggest "monitoring browsing of the electronic catalog by the first user to determine whether items accessed by the first user are on electronic wish lists of the affiliated users; and notifying the first user during said browsing of the electronic catalog when an accessed item is determined to be on an electronic wish list of an affiliated user," in the context of the other limitations of the claim.

With respect to independent Claim 24, Knorr and Robertson do not collectively teach or suggest "monitoring browsing of the electronic catalog by the second user and, during said browsing of the electronic catalog, notifying the second user when an item accessed by the second user is on the electronic wish list of the first user," in the context of the other limitations of the claim.

Appl. No. : **09/933,277**
Filed : **August 20, 2001**

With respect to independent Claim 33, Knorr and Robertson do not collectively teach or suggest “when the first user accesses a first item in the electronic catalog, determining whether, and notifying the first user if, the first item is similar to an item on an electronic wish list of an affiliated user, as reflected by the similarity data,” in the context of the other limitations of the claim.

In connection with the foregoing limitations of Claims 1, 12, 24 and 33, the Office Action appears to rely primarily or solely on Robertson. Robertson discloses a gift registry service in which users can request to be notified or reminded of certain events, such as product sales of online merchants, and birthdays of other users. See Robertson at, e.g., abstract, Figs. 16 and 25, and col. 14, line 53 to col. 15, line 48. While this feature of Robertson may involve notifications generally, it does not involve or suggest the notification features described in Applicants’ independent claims. Nothing can be taken from Knorr or the other art of record to cure this deficiency in Robertson.

Because Knorr and Robertson do not collectively suggest the notification-related features of the independent claims, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

With respect to independent Claim 24, the rejection is also improper for the independent reason that Knorr and Robertson do not collectively teach or suggest the following in the context of the other limitations of the claim: “in response to a second user purchasing an item from the electronic wish list of the first user, updating a data repository to indicate that the first user is affiliated with the second user.” The Office Action does not fully address this portion of the claim. The Office Action also fails to fully address the rejected dependent claims, many of which recite additional patentable distinctions over Knorr and Robertson.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper, and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. : **09/933,277**
Filed : **August 20, 2001**

If any issues remain, Mr. Pezzuto is respectfully requested to call the undersigned representative at his direct dial number of 949-721-2950.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: May 4, 2007

By: /RJS38297/

Ronald J. Schoenbaum

Registration No. 38,297

Attorney of Record

Customer Number 20,995

949-721-2950